

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
AT BLUEFIELD

BLAKE SANDLAIN,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:19-00229

FCI MCDOWELL WARDEN,

Respondent.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

By Standing Order, this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Omar J. Aboulhosn for submission of findings and recommendation regarding disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn submitted to the court his Findings and Recommendation on September 6, 2019, in which he recommended that the court deny petitioner's Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Costs, (ECF No. 1), deny petitioner's Motion for Writ of Mandamus, (ECF No. 2), and remove this case from the court's active docket.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), petitioner was allotted fourteen days and three mailing days in which to file any objections to Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn's Findings and Recommendation. The failure of any party to file such objections within the time allowed constitutes a waiver of

such party's right to a de novo review by this court. Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363 (4th Cir. 1989).

Neither party filed any objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation within the requisite time period. Accordingly, the court adopts the Findings and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Aboulhoshn as follows:

1. Petitioner's Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Costs is **DENIED**;
2. Petitioner's Motion for Writ of Mandamus is **DENIED**;  
and
3. The Clerk is directed to remove this case from the court's active docket.


Additionally, the court has considered whether to grant a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A certificate will not be granted unless there is "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The standard is satisfied only upon a showing that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by this court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). The court concludes that the governing

standard is not satisfied in this instance. Accordingly, the court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

The Clerk is further directed to forward a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to plaintiff.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 8th day of October, 2019.

ENTER:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David A. Faber  
Senior United States District Judge